

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/655,034	09/05/2003	Hatsuhiko Harashina	2101-12	8587
23117	7590 06/21/2005		EXAM	INER
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR			SZEKELY,	PETER A
ARLINGTON		OOK	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,	•	1714	

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/655,034	HARASHINA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Peter Szekely	1714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a		th the correspondence address				
Period for Reply	NIVIO SET TO EVOIDE A M	ONITU(C) EDOM				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a resepty within the statutory minimum of thirty od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB.	eply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11	April 2005.					
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ TI	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e, 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 32,33 and 35-43 is/are pending in t	he application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	rawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	Claim(s) <u>32,33 and 35-43</u> is/are rejected.					
 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and 	l/or election requirement					
	iro. Globalott roquitotticita					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	•					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		, ·				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	,	,				
		O 1100 / 1011011 O 10111 O 102.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. 	ents have been received. ents have been received in A	oplication No. <u>09/319,186</u> .				
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	st of the certified copies not	received.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	, ——	ummary (PTO-413)				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 	, ————————————————————————————————————)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	,				

Art Unit: 1714

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 32, 33 and 35-43 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,642,289. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to add the antioxidant of claim 8 of the patent to the article of claim 12 of the patent in order to improve the stability of the shaped article which can be a motor vehicle part according to claim 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Application/Control Number: 10/655,034 Page 3

Art Unit: 1714

4. Claims 32, 33, 35 and 38-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Du Pont de Nemours JP-6-179908, with Shinohara et al. 5,866,671 serving s its English translation.

5. The reference has been discussed already. Motor vehicle part is the intended use and as such it has no patentable significance. There is no structure or any other property claimed which would distinguish the claimed motor vehicle part from any other molded article. Applicants' claims are not novel. In the alternative, since claim 1 of the reference explicitly claims low formaldehyde concentration levels, which is the aim of applicants' invention, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use the moldable compositions of Shinohara et al., for molding other articles requiring the same low formaldehyde levels, i. E. motor vehicle parts.

Claim Objections

- 6. Claim 38 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The glyoxyldiureide concentration of the claim exceeds the limits of the claim it depends from.
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Szekely whose telephone number is (571) 272-1124. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m. Tuesday-Friday.

Art Unit: 1714

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peter Szekely Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714

P.S. 6/16/05